## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

JOHNNY GRAYSON,

Petitioner,

V.

Civil Action No. 5:09CV53 (Criminal Action No. 5:08CR46)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

(STAMP)

Respondent.

## MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

On October 8, 2010, this Court issued a memorandum opinion and order affirming and adopting the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying the petitioner's § 2255 petition. The order advised the petitioner that the petitioner's failure to to the magistrate judge's proposed findings recommendation bars the petitioner from appealing the judgment of this Court. See 18 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845 (4th Cir. 1985); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). This Court did not address whether a certificate of appealability should issue. Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 and Section 2255 Cases provides that the district court "must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant" in such cases. This Court's October 8, 2010 memorandum opinion and order is a final order adverse to the applicant in a case in which 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) requires issuance of a certificate of appealability to take an appeal.

This Court finds that it is inappropriate to issue a certificate of appealability in this matter. Specifically, the Court finds that the petitioner has not made a "substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). Upon review of the record, this Court finds that the petitioner has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, the petitioner is DENIED a certificate of appealability.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Clerk is directed to transmit a copy of this order to the pro se petitioner by certified mail and to counsel of record herein.

DATED: October 13, 2010

/s/ Frederick P. Stamp, Jr.
FREDERICK P. STAMP, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE